

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

	TO DIVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
FILING DATE		DETERSIONE 671-WCG	4244	
12/01/2000	Reinhard Storbeck	BEIERSDORI GIT III G		
08/16/2002		EXAM	INER	
aw		ZIRKER, I	DANIEL R	
Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Y 10017		1771	10	
		DATE MAILED: 08/16/200	2	
	12/01/2000 590 08/16/2002	12/01/2000 Reinhard Storbeck  590 08/16/2002  1ghlin & Marcus, P.A.  aw  Street	FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  12/01/2000 Reinhard Storbeck BEIERSDORF 671-WCG  12/01/2002 EXAM  2IRKER, I  ART UNIT	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-			- ' <i>/</i> I
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit	
—The MAILING DATE of this communicat	the cover shee	et beneath the correspondence add	iress—
—The MAILING DATE of this communicat	tion appears on the core. She		
riod for Reply SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	3	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAIL	ING DATE
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	YIS SET TO EXPINE	<del></del>	
- Extensions of time may be available under the provision from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, such period sh.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply.	(30) days, a reply within the statutory in the statutory will, by statute, cause the application	S from the mailing date of this communication to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 13	on . 3).
tatus  Responsive to communication(s) filed on	7/11/07		·
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1/00/00		
This action is FINAL.	and for formal matters.	prosecution as to the merits is cio	sed in
accordance with the practice differ			
Disposition of Claims  Claim(s)	17	is/are pending in the ap	plication.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from c	onsideration.
Of the above claim(s)		in/ara allowed	
Of the above claim(s)	17	is/are rejected.	
1) Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	
		are subject to restriction	n or election
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		are subject to receive	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		requirement.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		requirement.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9	requirement.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	requirement.  48.  roved 🗆 disapproved.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9- is □ app is/are objected to by the Exa	requirement.  48.  roved 🗆 disapproved.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Example of the content of the specification is objected to by the Example of the content of	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9- is □ app is/are objected to by the Exa aminer.	requirement.  48.  roved 🗆 disapproved.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9- is □ app is/are objected to by the Exa aminer.	requirement.  48.  roved 🗆 disapproved.	
☐ Claim(s)—☐ Claim(s)—☐ Claim(s)—☐ Claim(s)—☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is lare objected to by the Examiner.  The Examiner.	requirement.  18. roved □ disapproved. miner.  11 9(a)-(d).	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94 is	requirement.  48.  roved	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for formula in the CERT ☐ received.	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is/are objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner.  Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is □ app is/are objected to by the Examiner.  Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is/are objected to by the Examiner.	requirement.  18.  roved	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for formula is made of a claim for formula is specified. ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Comparison of the CERT) ☐ received in Application No. (Series Comparison of the CERT) ☐ received in Application No. (Series Comparison of the CERT)	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is app is app is/are objected to by the Exa aminer. The Examiner. Particular or is a priority under 35 U.S.C. § FIFIED copies of the priority documents of the priority doc	requirement.  18.  roved	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for formula in the CERT ☐ received.	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is app is app is/are objected to by the Exa aminer. The Examiner. Particular or is a priority under 35 U.S.C. § FIFIED copies of the priority documents of the priority doc	requirement.  18.  roved	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form of the CERT☐ received. ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Compared in this national stage application of the Certified copies not received:	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is □ app is/are objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner.  Parent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is □ app i	requirement.  48.  roved	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is □ app is/are objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner.  Parent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is □ app is □ app i	requirement.  18.  roved	3
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for formulation of the CERT☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Congressived in this national stage application of the Certified copies not received:	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9-is appropriate in appropriate in appropriate in appropriate in a propriate in a pr	requirement.  48.  roved	3 plication, PTO-1:

Serial No. 09/728,839

Art Unit 1771

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg, taken either individually, or in view of the <u>Handbook of Adhesives</u>, 2nd Edition (1977) chapter 47, substantially for the reasons set forth in paragraph No. 2 of Paper No. 5, together with the following additional observations. Applicant argues, in essence, that one of ordinary skill in the art would see no equivalence at all between the use of a film, as opposed to a paper backing in applicant's claimed genus of adhesive tapes. However, the Examiner must respectfully disagree, since he believes that applicant's arguments in effect completely ignore the very high level of ordinary skill in the adhesive tape art. Applicant's arguments (Response, pages 3-4) concerning the non-equivalence of paper as opposed to the use of film backings is seen to be unwarranted speculation in view of the cited Handbook teaching of their general equivalence and the availability of methods to improve paper backings "internal strength (ply strength or delamination resistance) " - see page 725, column 1, bottom paragraph. Note also that while the Handbook reference does not expressly teach the initial equivalence of paper versus film backings, page 725 is filled with techniques to change the physical properties of whatever type of backing is selected so as to arrive at a desired set of

Serial No. 09/728,839
Art Unit 1771

end properties after employing a variety of techniques well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. As to Weinberg's teachings (column 1, line 48) of using a paper backing, it is a teaching that hardly would be described as "quite emphatic" in the Examiner's strong opinion.

judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending applications Nos. 09/518,463 or 09/490,709 in view of the Handbook of Adhesives, 2nd Edition (1977) Chapter 47, substantially for the reasons set forth in paragraph No. 4 of Paper No. 5, together with the following observations. The rationale for the Examiner's position, and the argument presented by applicant are essentially identical as that set forth in the preceding paragraph so no further amplification is needed.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

4. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 09/518,463 or 09/490,709 which has common co-inventors with the instant application, each in view of the Handbook of Adhesives reference, substantially for the reasons set forth in paragraph No. 6 of Paper No. 5. As with the prior provisional rejection, the rationale of the Examiner's rejection and the traversal by

Serial No. 09/728,839

Art Unit 1771

applicants of this rejection are each substantially identical to their positions set forth above. Accordingly, no further amplification is seen to be necessary.

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS

ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS

OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION

IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED

STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE

ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE

MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE

STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM

THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0031. The examiner

Serial No. 09/728,839

Art Unit 1771

can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Dzirker:cdc

August 13, 2002

DANIEL ZIRKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300
1700

Daniel Zuku